

REMARKS

The Office Action dated July 30, 2008 has been received and considered. In this response, claims 70, 81, and 88 have been amended and claims 71, 78, 89, and 96 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Support for the amendments may be found in the specification and drawings as originally filed. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in the present application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

Objection to Claims 78, 81, 82, and 96

At pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action, claims 78, 81, 82, and 96 were objected to. Claim 81 has been amended consistent with the Office's remarks, and in an effort to advance the present application to issuance, claims 78 and 96 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Withdrawal of the objection therefore is respectfully requested.

Obviousness Rejection of Claims 70-75, 77, 78, 80-93, 95-101

At page 4 of the Office Action, claims 70-75, 77, 78, 80-93, 95-101 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Porter (U.S. 5,864,682) in view of Lin (U.S. 2003/0093801). This rejection is respectfully traversed with amendment.

Claims 71, 84-87, and 89 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, thereby obviating their rejection.

Independent claim 70 has been amended and presently recites the features of "the frame index comprising a plurality of frame index entries corresponding to a plurality of frames of the video stream, each frame index entry comprising: an identifier of a frame type of a corresponding frame; and an indicator of whether the corresponding frame is critical to the video stream." Support for this amendment can be found at, *inter alia*, page 11, lines 4 and 5 of the Present Application. Independent claim 88 has been similarly amended. The proposed combination of Porter and Lin fails to disclose or render obvious the claimed frame index of claims 70 and 88. To illustrate, neither Porter nor Lin discloses or renders obvious the feature of each frame index entry of a frame index comprising "an indicator of whether the corresponding frame is critical to the video stream" as provided by claims 70 and 88. Accordingly, the

proposed combination of Porter and Lin fails to disclose or render obvious each and every feature recited by claims 70 and 88, as well as the particular combinations of features recited by claims 72-75, 77, 78, 80-87, 90-93, and 95-101 at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from one of claims 70 or 88. Moreover, these claims recite additional novel features.

Further, not only does the combination of Porter and Lin fail to arrive the particular combination of features recited by claims 70 and 88, it would not be obvious to combine Porter and Lin as proposed by the Office in view of claims 70 and 88. Claims 70 and 88 each provide that the claimed first subset and the claimed second subset each comprise an intra-coded frame and at least one forward-predicted frame. Rather, as discussed in the previous Response, Porter expressly teaches

Rewind operations are performed in the same manner as fast and slow forward operations with the exception that only I-frames are selected for rewind operations (regardless of whether the rewind operations are fast or slow). P and B frames are automatically skipped because they cannot be decoded unless frames that precede them in the original MPEG file are processed before them. However, during rewind operations, the frames on which P and B frames depend will be processed after the P and B frames that depend on them.

Porter, col. 20, line 61 to col. 21, line 3 (emphasis added). As Porter expressly states that **only** I-frames (intra-coded frames) are “selected for rewind operations”, it is unclear as to why one of ordinary skill in the art would disregard this express teaching of Porter and select both I-frames AND P-frames for “rewind operations” in view of Lin as proposed by the Office. As such combination would be contrary to the express teachings of Porter, and as prior art references are to be considered in their entirety, it is respectfully submitted that the Office has failed to establish that one of ordinary skill in the art would find it obvious to combine Porter and Lin as proposed by the Office.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is

respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

The Applicants believe no additional fees are due, but if the Commissioner believes additional fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-1835.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ryan S. Davidson/
Ryan S. Davidson, Reg. No. 51,596
LARSON NEWMAN ABEL & POLANSKY, LLP
5914 West Courtyard Drive, Suite 200
Austin, Texas 78730
(512) 439-7100 (phone)
(512) 439-7199 (fax)

October 29, 2008
Date